

One sided research often funded by the very industry needing monitored is regularly cited by both corporate public relations staff and public stewards (the latter supposedly paid or elected to protect public interests not those of trans-national corporations like the telecommunications industry).

In my own experience interacting with EWEB (an electricity and water providing utility), I have witnessed grossly inadequate, partial and biased information provided to the public on its web site and by staff.

Much of the bias is due to their predisposition to favor an as yet untested digital wireless smart meter technology on a poorly informed public instead of engaging the community in an open ended debate and encouraging scholarly and journalistic research as to the pros and cons of wireless (and wired) smart meters.

EWEB staff and some board members, like many apologists for proliferating wireless technology, neglect to include corrections by Daniel Hirsch, nuclear policy analyst, University of California, Santa Cruz, who did a critique of the conclusions of the California Council on Science and Technology report on smart meters cited on EWEB's web site and other sites promoting wireless smart meters.

EWEB also advises ratepayer-owners to rely on FCC guidelines which are shamefully obsolete in today's wireless world.

Putting a magnifying glass on my experience with this one utility (some of whose board members boast it to be the best utility in the nation), I can report that, under the smart meter/ advanced meter infrastructure FAQ, one question was: Are there any issues with Radio Frequency?

Initially in July, 2011, the first sentence in the answer was simply: _No._ followed by a paragraph dismissing health issues. Shortly after staff met and interacted with members of the newly formed Families for Safe Meters (DOT.org is its web site) and medical professionals separate from the group - the _No._ sentence was deleted.

EWEB staff, board and some ratepayer-owners in the last two years have begun to climb the learning

plateau to at least have enough savvy to delete the word _NO._ and to engage in some dialogue whereas in most areas dominated by Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs) the conversation has not been as civil.

The stuff of history is anecdotal stories - it is those I will discuss in PART TWO of my comments. PART THREE includes articles and videos recommended for your review and thoughtful consideration as you revise guidelines for RF/MW.

PART TWO: Anecdotal reports.

History is full of anecdotes - yet often utility decision makers and government entities choose to discount true stories about personal effects experienced from exposure to EMF.

Many people who have EMF sensitivity cannot even attend public hearings and public input sessions due to the proliferation of wireless tech. Some others, like myself, have interviewed sensitive individuals and found, e.g., these three incidents:

ONE. A woman in Eugene, OR, wrote a letter to the EWEB Board describing how a digital natural gas meter had been installed at her house; she slept less than two feet away from it for almost two years and became quite ill. It was not until she met a local doctor that went to her house and discovered this _NON SMART_ meter (what a gas company upper level employee called it) was emitting every 14 seconds that she discovered the source of her health problems and took steps to mitigate them by having the meter removed.

This is brought up to show how little the utilities are informed and if informed willing to provide information to the public about transmissions sometimes seen as intellectual property.

EWEB board members had said that wireless gas smart meters had been installed and there were NO PROBLEMS!

EXAMPLE TWO. A California woman called me with her story about how she could no longer use electricity at night in her house but had to use a flashlight after dark. She and her retired husband, (a

scientist and she and he technology specialists), had moved into an apartment with wireless smart electric meters 40 ft. away from their living space, but she experienced numerous health problems. By the time she called me, they had spent most of their retirement savings and were trying to find a safe place for her to survive. I do know where she ended up.

(When they had moved into a house with solar electric cells, by the way, they had to have the PVs inactivated due to fields caused by the inverter that adversely affected her.)

EXAMPLE THREE. A woman called me from North Dakota who had to use candles at night because she could no longer be exposed to electricity due to her reactions to a wireless water smart meter installed on the other half of her duplex.

Her symptoms included skin tingling (a decades long piano player, she could no longer play the piano); her heart palpitations caused her to see a doctor because she thought she might have a heart attack. She threatened to sue her water utility if a wireless digital water meter were installed on her side of the duplex. She ended up vacating the rental where she had lived for several year.

PART THREE: Research

Smart Meters: Correcting the Gross Misinformation

should be required reading - signed by 50 international scientists and health professionals. (6.11.12). The article can be easily found by putting the title in a search engine.

Also pls. see the two part video (one hour total) of

Dr. Paul Dart whose live presentation to EWEB 7.23.13 can be found at [RadiationReport \(DOT\) com/Smart Meters](http://RadiationReport(DOT)com/SmartMeters)

He also presented to them a 70 page written report which may soon be on the Internet.

Dr. Dart, M.D., Eugene, OR, six other doctors and an engineering professional reviewed 200 medical articles over 18 months and assembled an illuminating slide show outlining the findings of cell phone studies in many nations (but the USA is notably absent from most studies).

Dr. Dart, M.D., Eugene, OR, six other doctors and an engineering professional did a review of 200 medical articles over 18 months and assembled an illuminating slide show outlining the findings of cell phone studies in many nations (but the USA is notably absent from most studies).

Part Two of Dr. Paul Dart videos (numbers refer to minutes/seconds)

For your convenience I provide a few of the remarks to the best of my ability and locations on Part Two of the two part video footage at [RadiationReport \(DOT\) com/SmartMeters](http://RadiationReport(DOT)com/SmartMeters) -

6:18 INCREASED BREAST CANCER

Netanya, Israel relative cancer several hundred percent more in males and females but especially in increased breast cancer in women near a cell phone tower 1500 watts, 850 megahertz but 1000 times less than FCC guidelines for 850 megahertz exposure.

Comparing cancer rates with 677 persons near cell tower versus 1,200 matched controls in another area of the city, significant increased rates of cancer especially BREAST CANCER INCREASE IN WOMEN

9:14 CANCER DEATHS

In Bela Horizonte, Brasil, a town of 2 million rated as the best quality of life in Latin America by the UN one year, a 2011 study was done by which date 856 cell towers installed. Up to 500 meters from a cell tower there were significant increases in cancer deaths.

12:12 FEMALE MICE

Subject female mice in Thessalonica, Greece, kept in VHF/UHF antenna park with power densities 1,000 times lower than FCC guidelines; after five matings, female mice were all sterile and this was irreversible even when they were moved.

14:40 NESTING BIRDS

Compared storks nesting near cell tower site - 30 nests within 200 meters versus 30 nests within 300 meters; total productivity significantly decreased; partial productivity changed but not statistically significantly nests without young significantly increased in nests with the exposed birds.

~~~~

Also pls. view the one hour fourth video on the <RadiationReport (DOT) /SmartMeters> site with the public input of 18 persons recommending to EWEB to put an indefinite moratorium on installing wireless smart electric and water meters (8.6.13).

~~~~

Pls., especially those who are medically trained on staff, become familiar with this article published in 2013 by Martin Pall, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, Washington State University:

<[http://onlinelibrary \(DOT\) wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jcmm.12088/abstract](http://onlinelibrary (DOT) wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jcmm.12088/abstract)>

~~~~

## GOVERNMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS THAT BAN OR WARN AGAINST WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY

(Put the above title in a search engine for a wireless tech warnings chronology assembled by the Cell Phone Task Force (DOT) org starting with:

1993: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): The FCC's exposure standards are "seriously flawed." Official comments to the FCC on guidelines for evaluation of electromagnetic effects of radio frequency radiation, FCC Docket ET 93-62, November 9, 1993.

1993: Food and Drug Administration (FDA): "FCC rules do not address the issue of long-term, chronic exposure to RF fields." Comments of the FDA to the FCC, November 10, 1993.

1993: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH): The FCC's standard is inadequate because it "is based on only one dominant mechanism" adverse health effects caused by body heating." Comments of NIOSH to the FCC, January 11, 1994.

and ending with (at least in this compendium)

Feb 13, 2012: Citing safety concerns, the Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association representing 45,000 teachers, is calling for a ban on new Wi-Fi installations in the province's 1,400-plus Catholic schools and advocating that computers in all new schools should be hardwired as well. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/story/2012/02/13/toronto-oecta-wifi> (DOT) html

March, 2012: the Austrian Medical Association (ÖAK) releases guidelines for the diagnosis and

treatment of health problems caused by exposure to electromagnetic fields.â€”[http://www \(DOT\)](http://www.aerztekammer.at/documents/10618/976981/EMF-Guideline.pdf)  
[aerztekammer.at/documents/10618/976981/EMF-Guideline.pdf](http://www.aerztekammer.at/documents/10618/976981/EMF-Guideline.pdf)

June 19, 2012: The Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection has officially recommended that WiFi not be used in schools.

[http://youtu \(DOT\) be/5CemiJ-yIA4](http://youtu.be/5CemiJ-yIA4).

25 Aug 2012: Israeli Minister of Health Rabi Yaakov Litzman states that he supports calls to action for a ban on Wi-Fi in schools.

~~~~~

Wired smart meters such as ones over power line can be problematic for electro sensitive persons also, by the way.